



**PRESUPPOSITION OF THE NARRATOR'S UTTERANCES
IN *SILET* INFOTAINMENT**

A THESIS

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

Submitted by:

WINDA ASTUTI

13020111130020

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG**

2015

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer truthfully confirms that in fact she arranged this thesis by herself without copying any results from other researches in other degrees of any university. The writer also confirms that she does not cite and quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

Semarang, October 2015

WindaAstuti

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

“All our dreams can come true if we have the courage to pursue them”

Walt Disney

“A pessimist sees the difficulty in every opportunity, an optimist sees the opportunity in every difficulty”

Sir Winston Churchill

“Barangsiapa yang keluar dalam nuntun tilmu maka ia adalah seperti berperang di jalan Allah hingga pulang”

H.R. Tirmidzi

*This thesis is dedicated to
my beloved family and
to everyone who helped me accomplish this thesis*

APPROVAL

Approved by,
Thesis Advisor

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum.
NIP. 19611109 198703 2 001

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata I Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

On October 2015

Chair Person

First Member

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum.

19661004 199001 2 001

Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S, M.Hum.

19790822 200801 2 013

Second Member

Third Member

Dra. Hj. Wiwik Sundari, M.Hum.

19590607 199003 2 001

Dr. J. Herudjati P, M.Sc.

19530327 198103 1 006

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Firstly, The writer would like to praise the almighty Allah SWT who always gives strength, patience, blessing, and health so that the writer could complete this thesis entitled **‘Presupposition of the Narrator’s Utterances in *Silet Infotainment*’**.

Furthermore, the writer would like to express the deepest gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum., as the writer’s thesis advisor. Thank you for all of your knowledge, correction, advice, and support. Besides, thank you for your patience to guide the writer to complete this thesis. You guide like a mother. I could not imagine having a better advisor than you.

My deepest thanks also go to:

1. Dr. Rediyanto M. Noor, M.Hum., the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.,
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S., M.Hum., the Head of English Department, Diponegoro University.,
3. Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A., as Head of Linguistics Section of English Departement in Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.,
4. Arido Laksono, S.S., M.Hum., the writer’s academic advisor.,
5. All of English Department’s lecturers of Faculty of Humanity of Diponegoro University. Thank you for their knowledge and dedication.,

6. My Father H. Kadino and My Mother Hj. Sri Hastuti for their love, praying, blessing, support, patience and many other things that could not be counted by the writer. Hope Allah SWT giving them blessing, health, long life, and every best thing.,
7. My five younger brothers and two younger sisters (Aldino Putra, HarioSubangun, MuliaAdiNugroho, NurajiWibowo, Hasan Al Fauzi, Amanda, and Dhealora) for their love and support. Hope all of them are blessed by Allah.,
8. My late grandfather, Alm. Suparmin and Alm. Suharsono. Thank you for their previous praying, blessing, and support. Hope Allah SWT gives them the best place. Then, for my grandmother, thank you for all of their praying and support.,
9. My uncle, H. Sumardi. Thank you for the support, advice and love. Without you, I could not own a spirit to undergo the worst moment during my undergraduate study and a vision to struggle and continue my study. Then, my aunt, Hj. Linda Handayani, for the great knowledge, advice, and support. Thank you for the inspiration of being a smart and knowledgeable teacher.,
10. My Roaring 20's friends (MarganiRahmaSetyarini, Gloria Firmanti, YuyunTiarawati, Niesrin, SeptianHerawati, VintaFatmawati, and Ardis Septi). Thank you for their memorable happiness, funny, absurd or even sadness moment. See you on top.,

11. My team in EKOBIS BEM (WuriPangestuti, Lona Windiana, AdindaAfrilinda, DessyPutri, Risky Suftamdar, Widy Mega, and AskahHapsari). Thank you for every single thing they did, especially in completing our projects. All of them were the best team I ever joined with. Success for them all.,
12. My friends in BEM (Kabinet Symphony and Kabinet Nusantara). Thank you for your experience and knowledge. My president and vice president (Dinar Fitra and HamamAnwaruddin) for supporting me as your minister.,
13. My friends in Class A English Department 2011. Love you all !!!.,
14. My friends in IKEMAS. Thank you for your experience and knowledge.

The writer realizes that this thesis still far from perfect. The writer will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and suggestion to make this thesis better.

Finally, the writer expects that this thesis will be useful for the reader who wants to learn pragmatic presupposition.

Semarang, October 2015

WindaAstuti

TABLE OF CONTENT

COVER.....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
ABSTRAK.....	xii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Research.....	1
1.2 Research Questions	3
1.3 Purposes of the Study	3
1.4 Scope of the Study.....	4
1.5 Previous Studies	4
1.6 Writing Organization.....	7
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
2.1 Presupposition	10
2.2 Presupposition Trigger	13
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	20
3.1 Type of the Research	20
3.1 Data, Population, Sample, Sampling Technique	21
3.3 Method of Collecting Data	22
3.4 Method of Analysis Data.....	22
CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS	24
4.1 The Presupposition Triggers in Narator's Utterance.....	24
4.1.1 Single Trigger	24
4.1.1.1 Existential Presupposition.....	25

4.1.1.2 Factive Presupposition.....	26
4.1.1.3 Lexical Presupposition.....	28
4.1.1.4 Structural Presupposition.....	30
4.1.1.5 Non-Factive Presupposition.....	32
4.1.1.6 Counter Factual Presupposition	34
4.1.2 Double Triggers.....	36
4.1.2.1 Structural Presupposition and Factive Presupposition.....	36
4.1.2.2 Lexical Presupposition and Factive Presupposition.....	39
4.1.2.3 Factive Presupposition and Lexical Presupposition	41
4.1.3 Multiple Triggers.....	44
4.1.3.1 Structural Presupposition, Factive Presupposition and Existential Presupposition.....	44
4.2 The Function of Presupposition in Narrator's Utterance	48
4.2.1 Supporting Narrator's Position	48
4.2.1.1 Narrator's Position in Conveying the Factual Information	49
4.2.1.2 Narrator's Position in Conveying the 'Case' of Information	50
4.2.1.3 Narrator's Position in Conveying the Tacit Information	50
4.2.1.4 Narrator's Position in Conveying the Untrue Information	51
4.2.2 Leading the Viewer's Assumption	52
4.2.2.1 The Viewer's Assumption of the Factual Information	53
4.2.2.2 The Viewer's Assumption of the 'Case' of Information	53
4.2.2.3 The Viewer's Assumption of the Tacit Information.....	54
4.2.2.4 The Viewer's Assumption of the Untrue Information.....	54
4.2.3 Raising the Viewer's Belief.....	55
4.2.3.1 The Viewer's Belief through the Factual Information.....	56
4.2.3.2 The Viewer's Belief through the 'Case' of Information.....	56
4.2.3.3 The Viewer's Belief through the Tacit Information	57
4.2.3.4 The Viewer's Belief through the Untrue Information	57

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX	

ABSTRAK

Praanggapan atau presuposisi merupakan asumsi tersirat yang menyertai ujaran-ujaran tertentu. Meskipun tidak terucap secara langsung, asumsi tersebut tetap tersampaikan. Praanggapan atau presuposisi dapat diteliti dalam kegiatan penyampaian informasi melalui program yang ditayangkan oleh televisi. Salah satu program televisi yang bertujuan menyampaikan informasi adalah *infotainment*. Dalam Skripsi ini, penulis mencoba menguraikan praanggapan atau presuposisi yang terdapat dalam ujaran *narrator infotainment* Silet.

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis pemicu praanggapan yang muncul dalam ujaran *narrator infotainment* Silet. Penulis juga akan mencoba menguraikan fungsi-fungsi dari praanggapan yang terdapat dalam ujaran *narrator infotainment* Silet.

Dalam mengumpulkan data, penulis menggunakan metode observasi *non-participant* dan dilanjutkan dengan teknik catat. Data kemudian dipilih dengan menggunakan teknik *purposive sampling*. Penulis menggunakan metode padan pragmatic, metode refleksif introspektif, dan teknik hapus untuk menganalisis data. Data yang dianalisis oleh penulis merupakan ujaran-ujaran yang mengandung praanggapan.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat 55 ujaran dari 108 ujaran *narrator* yang mengandung praanggapan. Penulis menemukan bahwa satu ujaran mempunyai kemungkinan untuk memiliki lebih dari satu pemicu praanggapan yang mewakili jenis praanggapan yang berbeda. Penulis lalu mengkategorikan praanggapan tersebut berdasar jumlah pemicu praanggapan yang ditemukan. Kategori tersebut adalah pemicu tunggal, pemicu ganda, dan pemicu jamak. Berkaitan dengan praanggapan tersebut, terdapat tiga fungsi praanggapan dalam ujaran *narrator*. Fungsi tersebut adalah mendukung posisi *narrator*, menuntun asumsi penonton, dan menumbuhkan kepercayaan penonton.

Kata Kunci: praanggapan, pragmatik, ujaran, narrator, infotainment, Silet

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the writer would like to explain the background of the study, the research question, and the purposes of research. The writer would also like to describe the previous studies involving some research project that basically have the same topic with the writer's research. In addition, the writer would like to arrange the writing organization of research including chapter 1 until chapter 5.

1.1. Background of the Study

Information is one of the most important things for our society. In every time of our daily life, we are trying to acquire information as much as possible. In line with that, there are many information media able to be used to fulfill the needs of information. One of the examples is from electronic media through television. In these days, many programs are aired in television as the intermediaries for gaining information, one of which is infotainment.

Infotainment is soft news providing information in a way that is entertaining to its viewers (Branston, 2005). Infotainment becomes more popular since it delivers information of famous people or public figure. Nowadays, according to the research of LIPI, infotainment has dominated the television program. Almost every television station has an infotainment program, even more than one infotainment programs aired

every day. However, of the entirety of infotainment, *Silet* becomes one of the most favorite infotainment. It is proven by its winning in some television's awards for years. Here, different from news, infotainment has a characteristic that gives much portion to the narrator in presenting the program than the presenter does. The role of narrator can not be separated from infotainment since she narrates almost the whole information in each episode.

Unfortunately, sometimes what is delivered in infotainment is still only being an issue, or commonly called gossip. The truth of information from the gossip in infotainment is still questionable, whether it is valid or not. Since the gossip is spread widely and known by the society, infotainment through the role of the narrator in presenting the program tries to construct certain assumption to the viewer. However, it is impossible to utter some utterances for constructing certain assumption without presupposition.

Presupposition as the part of pragmatic studies becomes one of the key to influence the viewer's mind through the implicit assumption contained in the utterances. By denoting utterances with some words indicated as the trigger of presupposition, it may enable the narrator construct any certain assumption over the viewer's mind. The assumption constructed by the narrator here is certainly connected with the assumption owned by the narrator before presenting the program. The similarity of the assumption has an important role for the narrator in leading the viewer to believe or agree with the gossip which she presents. Although the assumption is not explicitly spoken, the assumption still can be conveyed since

between the narrator and the viewer shares the same knowledge. Therefore, the writer is interested in elaborating the presupposition in narrator's utterances through certain word considered as the trigger of presupposition. In addition, the writer is also interested in describing the function of presupposition since the writer believes that presupposition can result any advantage for the narrator during presenting the program.

1.2. Research Question

There are three research questions that will be the basis of the writer in analyzing the data. They are as follows.

1. What kinds of presupposition trigger appear in the narrator's utterances of *Silet* infotainment?
2. What are the functions of presupposition in the narrator's utterances of *Silet* infotainment?

1.3. Purposes of the Research

In accordance with the research question, there will be three purposes of the research as follows.

1. To identify the kinds of presupposition trigger which appear in the utterances spoken by the narrator in *Silet* infotainment.
2. To find out the function of presupposition in the narrator's utterances of *Silet* infotainment.

1.4. Scope of the Study

In this research, the writer focuses on pragmatics analysis of presupposition in the narrator's utterances of *Silet* infotainment during the program. The data are mainly from the utterances which contain presupposition. The data are taken from the episodes of Farhat and Regina aired in March 2014. The writer identifies the data based on the kinds of presupposition trigger found. The found trigger is tried to be deleted based on the deletion technique to see if the word is true as the trigger of presupposition or not. The writer also uses negation and denial to verify the existence of the presupposition. The data, then, is classified into six types of presupposition argued by Yule (1996). In addition, of the classification, the writer gives an explanation about the presupposed meaning and intended information contained in the utterances. Furthermore, the writer tries to reveal the function of presupposition which is still correlated with the classification of the data.

1.5. Previous Studies

In this case, the writer finds five previous studies written between 2007 and 2013. They are written by DyahKaryaningrum (2007), FebruanaDewiMasyitoh(2008), Afrin Rubiyanti (2013), RatihKusumaningsari (2010), and RachmaYulistina (2008). The previous studies will be described as follows:

The first research is entitled “Pragmatics Presupposition on Advertisement (Case Study on Fortune Magazine)” written by Dyah Karyaningrum. The purposes of the research are to describe the presupposition triggers and the possible presuppositions in the advertisement in Fortune Magazine. The data are classified according to presupposition triggers occurred in the advertisement by using presupposition theory by Levinson (1983). She found that there are 29 from 54 advertisements which contain presupposition trigger. Another study of advertisement is written by Februana Dewi Masyitoh. Her research has a title “A Pragmatics Presupposition Analysis on Advertisement in Kartini Magazines”. She found 144 advertisements that contain pragmatic presuppositions. This study discusses how much meaning kept in language of advertising which has aims to attract the readers to buy the goods.

The third research is entitled “Presupposition in Interrogative Headlines on “ALLKPOP” News and Gossip Site” written by Afrin Rubiyanti. The purpose of this research is to analyze the writer’s presupposition based on the news title written in interrogative form. Another purpose is to find indications of presupposition which appears to show the function of headlines that are written in interrogative form. She only focuses on presupposition trigger in question form. She divides interrogative form into three kinds; WH question, yes-no question and alternative question. For conclusion, she explains the function of each kind of interrogative form in headlines related to presupposition.

The fourth research is entitled “Pra-anggapan Pragmatik pada Novel *The Alchemist* Karya Paulo Coelho”. It is written by Ratih Kusumaningsari. This research has purposes to identify the presupposition trigger used in the novel, which is coming from Santiago Alchimest’s utterances and to analyze why the meaning contained in Santiago utterances made in the form of presupposition. She uses the theory of presupposition trigger proposed by Karttunen. (in Levinson, 1983). The result shows that from 190 utterances produced by Santiago, only 96 utterances contain presupposition. She concludes that the information that has become shared knowledge among the character becomes the main reason why their utterances are implicitly communicated.

Then, the last research to be reviewed is written by Rachma Yulistina. She discusses pragmatics presuppositions in drama script *The Wild Duck* written by Henrik Ibsen. Her research mentions that in these drama scripts there are 629 utterances containing presuppositions. Of the population, she takes 15 samples to be examined. The result of analysis shows that between presuppositions and background knowledge plays an important role within interaction. This can lead the interactions run smoothly.

In this case, there are differences between this research and the previous research. First, all of the previous research uses written text as the data, while in this research the writer uses utterances from the narrator of *Siletin* for entertainment as the data. Besides, in analyzing the data the writer uses the classification of presupposition types proposed by Yule (1993), whereas the previous research projects mostly use the

classification of presupposition types argued by Levinson (1983). Furthermore, mostly the previous research only identifies the presupposition. However, in this research, the writer not only identifies the presupposition, but also tries to explain the function of presupposition.

1.6. Writing Organization

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains Background of the Study, Research Question, Purposes of Research and the Previous Studies. Chapter 1 presents the subject matter of the research conducted by the writer.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter contains the theoretical framework of the research. There are Presupposition and Presupposition Triggers. Chapter 2 presents the theory used by the writer in analyzing the data.

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter contains The Type of Research, Data and Population as well as Sample and the Technique of Sampling, Method of Collecting Data, and Method of Analyzing Data. Chapter 3 presents the data and the method used in collecting, managing, and analyzing the data.

CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS

This chapter contains the analysis of data which includes the explanation of the presupposition trigger found and the function of presupposition. Chapter 4 presents the result of the research.

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

This chapter contains the conclusion of the research result.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer would like to give some explanation about theories of Presupposition, and Presupposition Triggers.

2.1. Presupposition

Simply, we can define presupposition as implicit assumption that accompanies certain utterances. The implicit assumption refers to the real world which then can be used to convey any certain information indirectly. Presupposition is useful for the efficiency of communication so that we should not say in detail the meaning or information we intend to convey.

(1) John does not write poems anymore

From the example (1) above, once after the conversation has ended, the listener will learn and understand something which is not directly mentioned within conversation. Something here is presupposition which the listener may assume that John wrote poem before. The speaker should not give a long explanation about John related to what he did in the past or what he does not do now with poem in order to reach the listener's interpretation. If the speaker described presupposition specifically, then the conversation would become very boring (Fromkin, 2003: 216-221).

Cummings (1999: 42) added by saying that presupposition is unspoken assumption or inference involved in certain utterances and expression. Presupposition is necessary in order to understand what people think and feel about cases, life or world around them. The way the speaker communicates the message or intended meaning to the listener, though it is not explicitly communicated, is as important as the success of a listener in understanding what speaker's intent within the frame of the utterances (Mey, 1993: 200-205).

Presupposition also connects with philosophy of logic. It has a function to indicate the unstated meaning or information contained in the utterances. As argued by Renkema, (1993: 154), “. . . the term of presupposition is originated in philosophy of logic, where it is used to denote a special type of implicit information.”

(2). It took John seven years to complete his studies

The sentence gives the following information that:

(2a) There is a person named John

(2b) John was a student

(2b) John was not a brilliant student

From the example (2), it can be seen that although it is not stated, the information of a person called John appears since there is someone called by that name. Then, the information of (2b) which infers John was a student comes from the statement of 'he spent seven years to finish his study'. Besides, implicit information

that he is not brilliant student appears since it normally only takes four or five years to finish the study.

Levinson (1983: 205) mentions two basic concepts to define presupposition. There are appropriateness and mutual or shared knowledge. Here, shared knowledge becomes important in order to interpret and explain the assumption against utterances spoken by the speaker. He also stated that utterances will not be appropriately spoken if there is no shared knowledge involved in the frame of speech. Moreover, in accordance with presupposition a context is also needed to make the utterances to be correctly interpreted by the listener. Venneman (1975: 314) in Brown (1995) called context as presupposition pool which helps the listener to determine the language, the topic, and the response within conversation. Context will also help the listener to hold the intended meaning of the speaker.

Stalnaker (1974: 48-50) said that presupposition is background of beliefs or assumptions owned by the speaker. These beliefs or assumptions are delivered by the speaker to his listener and considered by both of the speaker and the hearer to be delivered. The speaker will not inform the intended meaning obviously since he thinks that his listener has already known the 'case' which he delivers. Thus, the speaker considers the listener have understood that he is building assumptions or owning certain beliefs. The speaker also considers that the viewer has the same assumptions and beliefs like him about something in a discourse context. Stalnaker also connects presupposition with common ground. Common ground consists of

belief or assumption about what is accepted. To accept the belief or the assumption means to treat it as true for some reason.

To conclude, presupposition is implicit assumption owned by the speaker toward particular things. Besides, presupposition is also related to unspoken meaning or information of the speaker. In presupposition, the shared knowledge involved in the context of speech is useful as a means for the listener to draw inferences and understand over the speaker's assumption, meaning, or information contained in the utterance which is unsaid but still conveyed.

In this case, presupposition is different from entailment and implicature. Presupposition concerns with background assumptions of the speaker before producing utterances, while implicature is a set of additional meaning derived from the utterance produced by the speaker. Implicature reflects a more conveyed meaning than what is said (Yule, 1996: 25-36). On the other hand, entailment emphasizes on logical consequence following on what speaker utters. Entailment is connected with the terms of truth or falsity. Cruse (2000: 42) gave a concept of entailment which required that "...the truth of the entailed sentence must follow inescapably from the truth of the entailing sentence."

(3) Bella, who is poor but honest, born a sweet child

The utterances infer:

- (a) Bella has a child
- (b) Bella is a women

(c) Usually most poor people not honest

From the example above, sentence (a) is the presupposition of utterance (3). When the speaker says “Bella born a sweet child”, it presupposes that she has a child. Sentence (b) is an entailment since they have logical relation with utterance (3). The reason is because when Bella born a sweet child, the truth condition of a woman will be certainly included. Sentence (c) is an implicature of utterance (3). The use of word “but” may contain a meaning that poor people are mostly dishonest.

Another characteristic which makes presupposition different from implicature and entailment is in terms of negation or denial. As argued by Renkema (1993: 155), presupposition is unaffected by negation or denial. Presupposition isn't influenced by change of statement into negative or denial form. Presupposition of a statement remains to be true and unchanged which afterwards it is called as constancy under negation (Yule, 1996: 26).

2.2. Presupposition Trigger

In order to identify presupposition, some particular items or words can be used to conduct it. Once the speaker delivers a meaning to his listener within conversation, his utterances are built up by elements which are associated words, clauses, and constructions. Those elements, or called as presupposition triggers, has a function to represent presupposition (Karttunen in Levinson, 1983: 207). The presupposition triggers is classified into thirteen types. They are definite description, factive verbs, implicative verbs, change of state verbs, iteratives, verbs of judging,

temporal clause, cleft sentences, implicit cleft with stressed constituents, comparisons and contrasts, non-restrictive relative clauses, counterfactual conditionals, and questions.

Another explanation about presupposition triggers is argued by Yule (1996: 27). He gives a similar idea that presupposition is connected with the use of words, phrases, and structures. Then, it is considered as indicators potential of presupposition. The indicator of potential of presupposition is classified into six types of presupposition. Those six types of presupposition are existential presupposition, factive presupposition, non-factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition and counterfactual presupposition. The explanation of the six presupposition types will be as follows.

1. Existential presupposition

Existential presupposition is identical to show how the existence of something can be conveyed through presupposition. The existence is showed through definite word. Besides, it is not only related with possessionform (for example, 'your book' > 'you have a book'), but also related with noun phrases, as in the expressions like *the King of Sweden*, *the cat*, *the girl next door*, etc. Existential Presupposition, especially in possession form, can be used to show the 'case' of information (Brinton, 2000: 107).

(1) Nina's car is new and expensive

The sentence (1) above presupposes the existence of a girl named Nina and an expensive new car owned by her.

2. Factive presupposition

Factive presupposition has a relation with some words, or in this case ‘verbs’, which are used to represent a fact. Those verbs are ‘know’, ‘realize’, ‘regret’, as well as phrases involving ‘be’ with ‘aware’, ‘odd’, and ‘glad’. The presupposed information will be considered as factual and confirms its trustworthiness.

(2) Hary was not aware that she was married

>> She was married

Here, the phrases ‘*was not aware*’ gives an assumption that Hary does not know that actually *she was married*. So, the presupposed information that *she was married* is treated as the fact of her.

3. Lexical presupposition

Different from factive presupposition which the use of particular words is for showing the truth of presupposed information, lexical presupposition uses the particular words to presuppose another concept of unstated information. The particular words are like *manage*, *stop*, *start*, *again*, and *etc*. Then, along with its asserted meaning, it will be interpreted that the unstated information is understood.

(3) They started complaining

>> They were not complaining before

4. Structural presupposition

In structural presupposition, the use of certain structures will be presupposed that the part of structure is assumed and accepted to be true. The information after the structure will be interpreted to be known as the case. In structural presupposition, the structure has a characteristic as question form. There are three kinds of question form. They are wh-question, yes-no question, and alternative question. Each of question form presupposes different 'case'. In wh-question, the 'case' is already known to be true. It presupposes that there is missing information in the 'case' that has already known. In yes-no question and alternative question the 'case' hasn't been known to be true. The 'case' here has two possibilities based on the answer yes or no. As argued by Levinson (1983: 184-186), WH-questions obtains presupposition by replacing the WH-word by the appropriate existentially quantified variable, e.g. who by someone, where by somewhere, how by somehow, etc. Yes-no questions separates the presupposition in its possibility answer in either yes or no. Alternative question is similar with the type of question yes or no.

(4) When did he leave?

>> He left

From sentences (4) above, it can be seen that the presupposition appears after the question word 'when'. The presupposed information that 'he left' is regarded to be true since it is already known to be the 'case'.

5. Non-factive presupposition

It is assumed not to be true. Verbs like ‘dream’, ‘image’, and ‘pretend’ indicates the following information is not true. Palmer (1988: 67) adds the word “likely” to refer non-factive presupposition.

(5) I dreamed that I was rich

>> I was not rich

From the sentence (5) above, it can be seen that the following information after the verb ‘dream’ is considered to be not true.

6. A counterfactual presupposition

Such a structure of if-clause presupposes that information is considered as not true. However, the meaning of this presupposition isn’t only true, but it is the opposite of what is true or contrary to the fact.

(6) If you were my friend, you would have helped me.

>> You are not my friend

Based on the explanation above, there are some similarities and differences between the theory of presupposition trigger stated by Yule and Levinson. They are:

1. The existential presupposition stated by Yule and the definite descriptions argued by Levinson has a similar characteristics to recognize any definite noun phrases and possessive construction.

2. The verbs or phrases mentioned in the factive presupposition stated by Yule and factive verbs stated by Levinson have a same function to indicate the truth or actual condition of the presupposed information. However, Levinson gives more factive predicates which are not mentioned by Yule such as be sorry that, be proud that, be indifferent that, and be sad that.
3. Both of Lexical Presupposition argued Yule and Change of State argued Levinson can be used to represent other presupposed information which is unstated by using same words like stop and start. However, there are some verbs not included in Yule's theory of lexical presupposition. Those verbs are begin, continue, finish, carry on, cease, leave, enter, come, go, and arrive. Besides, differ from Yule which mentions the verb 'manage' in lexical presupposition, Levinson puts it in implicative verbs.
4. Structural Presupposition argued by Yule and Questions argued by Levinson similarly uses WH-question to identify interrogative sentence. However, Levinson's theory of Question involves other types of question such as yes-no question and alternative question as another indicator for determining presupposition in question.
5. Both counterfactual presupposition proposed by Yule and counterfactual condition proposed by Yule are having similar characteristics by using if conditional sentence.

6. For non-factive presupposition stated by Yule, there is no specific explanation or similar characteristics included in type of presupposition trigger stated by Levinson.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the writer would like to explain the type of research, data and population, sample and sampling technique. Moreover, the writer will also explain method of collecting data and method of analyzing data.

3.1. Type of Research

Basically, the type of research applied in this research is descriptive qualitative research. The explanation of the research type is distinguished based on the purpose and the data analysis. Concerning to the purpose of the research, this research is descriptive research. Best (1981:119) said that descriptive research is research that tries to describe an object in accordance with its actual reality. In this research, the writer chooses *Silet* infotainment and its narrator's utterance as the object of data. The writer focuses on analyzing the narrator's utterances which contain presupposition.

Then, in line with the data analysis, this research is qualitative research. As argued by Sugiyono (2012) qualitative research is research that positions the writer or the researcher as the key in analyzing the data. Qualitative research emphasizes the analysis on the interpretation of words, meaning, ideas, and any interactive relationship within an object or phenomenon. Here, the writer tries to interpret the

narrator's utterance which contains presupposition to find the presupposed meaning and intended information inside. The presupposition is classified based on the triggers found. The writer also tries to explain the function of presupposition in the narrator's utterance.

3.2. Data, Population, Sample and Technique of Sampling

The data used in this research are the narrator's utterance from one of the infotainment programs in television named *Silet*. The data are obtained from the episodes of Farhat Abbas and Regina. The writer is interested in the episodes of Farhat Abbas and Regina since the episodes mostly talk about a gossip between them. The gossip is related to the speculation of an affair between them. The episodes are limited only from which are aired in March 2014. From March 2014, there are seven episodes of Farhat Abbas and Regina's gossip included to be the data.

The population of this research comes from all of narrator's utterance during presenting the program. However, of the population, the writer only chooses some to be the sample of the research. The sample is chosen based on certain criteria. As stated by Arikunto (2006:139) purposive sampling is a technique of collecting sample based on certain purpose and criteria. Criteria in this research are certainly only for those which are tied to the subject matter of research. In another word, the sample is only the narrator's utterance that indicates presupposition.

3.3. Method of Collecting Data

In collecting the data, the writer uses non-participant observation method. The writer is not involved in the conversation. Moreover, the writer doesn't have any role except only being the observer (Mahsun 2005:93). In addition, the writer uses note taking method since the data are coming from videos. Firstly, the writer searched the videos of *Silet* infotainment in YouTube. Then, the videos were downloaded in order to collect narrator's utterances during presenting the program. The videos are limited only for which are aired on March 2014. Besides, the videos are also only from the gossip of Farhat Abbas and Regina. After that, the writer observed the utterances and made the transcription of the narrator's utterance. Thus, the transcription becomes the data that will be analyzed further.

3.4. Method of Analyzing Data

In analyzing the data, the writer uses identity method. According to Sudaryanto (1993), identity method is a method whose the determiners come from the outer aspect of language. The determiners are referent of language, speech organ, orthography, another language, and partner of speech. Of each determiner, it has its own features to represent the method used.

Concerning this research, the method used in analyzing the data is pragmatic identity since the role of the participant is considered very important to determine the presupposition. The participant here can be defined as the viewer of the program. In this case, the writer can be one of them. Besides, the writer also uses deletion

technique in analyzing the data. The deletion technique is used to prove whether the word is the trigger of presupposition or not. In addition, the writer uses reflective-introspective method. It helps the writer explaining the data based on the writer's understanding and knowledge of the data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer would like to discuss the result of research analysis which consists of the presupposition trigger in the narrator's utterances of *Silet* infotainment. Furthermore, the writer would also like to reveal the function of presupposition in the narrator's utterances.

4.1. The Presupposition Trigger in Narrator's Utterances.

In this subchapter, the writer would like to explain the presupposition trigger found in narrator's utterance during the program. This subchapter is divided into three parts since the writer finds the different number of trigger within one utterance. The writer finds that within one utterance, it is possible to have more than one trigger of presupposition. The one presupposition trigger found here refers to one presupposition type.

4.1.1. Single Trigger

In this case, the notion of single trigger means only one trigger which appears within one utterance. The trigger represents each type of presupposition. The explanation of each presupposition type in narrator's utterance will be discussed in the following subchapter.

4.1.1.1. Existential Presupposition

Existential presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterance as the existences of “something” or “particular thing”. The narrator assumes that she delivers the existence of any entities. Any entities here may defined by the writer as the ‘case’. In the data, the writer finds some triggers that indicate existential presupposition. They are *terlihat* (seen), *memperlihatkan* (show), *memberi* (give), and *-nya* (possessive form). The following is the example of existential presupposition.

(10) *Farhat terlihat meretas perjalanan bersama Regina ke Pulau Harapan*

‘Farhat seen do trip with Regina to Island Harapan’

Farhat is seen doing a trip with Regina to Harapan Island

It can be seen that utterance (10) is triggered by the word *terlihat* (seen) as the marker of existential presupposition. The narrator intends to show the existence of ‘something’ through the word *terlihat* (seen). The word *terlihat* (seen) indicates the existence ‘case’ of a trip with Regina to Harapan Island. Here, if the word *terlihat* (seen) is deleted, the utterance (10) only becomes explicit statement of the narrator. It will not contain any implicit assumption inside. Thus, from the utterance (10) above, the narrator may presuppose:

(10a) *Ada perjalanan bersama Regina ke Pulau Harapan*

‘There trip with Regina to Island Harapan’

There is a trip with Regina to Harapan Island

If utterance (10) which is indicated as existential presupposition reflected by the use of word *terlihat* (seen) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(10b) *Farhat tidak terlihat meretas perjalanan bersama Regina ke Pulau Harapan*
 ‘Farhat not seen do trip with Regina to Island Harapan’
 Farhat is not seen doing a trip with Regina to Harapan Island.

In this case, even utterance (10) is changed into negative form (10b), the presupposition of “there is a trip with Regina to Harapan Island” holds. It shows that (10a) is the presupposition of utterance (10).

By delivering existential presupposition, the narrator wants the viewer to acquire the information of ‘there is a trip with Regina to Harapan Island’. The narrator emphasizes the information that a trip with Regina to Harapan Island exists.

4.1.1.2. Factive Presupposition

Factive Presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterance as a fact. The narrator treats the information as a fact. The narrator assumes that she delivers the fact of information. In the data, the writer found some triggers that indicate factive presupposition. They are *tampak* (seem), *mengaku* (admit), *indah* (lovely), *saksi* (witness), *mencium* (smell), *siap* (ready), *entah* (do not know), and *menyembunyikan* (hide). The following is the example of factive presupposition.

(11) *Regina pun mengaku telah melakukan sejak tahun 2013 lalu*

‘Regina too admit already divorced Ilal since year 2013 past’

Regina admits that she has been divorced by Ilal since 2013

It can be seen that utterance (2) is triggered by the word *mengaku* (admit) as the marker of factive presupposition. The word *mengaku* (admit) indicates the fact of Regina and Ilal’s divorce. If the word *mengaku* (admit) is deleted, the utterance (11) only becomes an explicit statement of the narrator. It will not contain any implicit assumption inside. Therefore, from utterance (11) above, the narrator may presuppose:

(11a) *Regina telah ditalak Ilal sejak tahun 2013 lalu*

‘Regina already divorced Ilal since year 2013 past’

Regina has been divorced by Ilal since 2013

If utterance (11) which is indicated as factive presupposition reflected by the use of word *mengaku* (admit) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(11b) *Regina pun tidak mengaku telah ditalak Ilal sejak tahun 2013 lalu*

‘Regina too not admit already divorced Ilal since year 2013 past’

Regina does not admit that she has been divorced by Ilal since 2013

In this case, even utterance (11) is changed into negative form (11b), the presupposition of ‘Regina has been divorce by Ilal since 2013’ holds. It shows that (11a) is the presupposition of utterance (11).

By delivering factive presupposition, the narrator wants the viewer to acquire the information about the fact of ‘Regina has been divorce by Ilal since 2013’. The narrator emphasizes the information that a divorce between Regina and Ilal since 2013 is a fact.

4.1.1.3. Lexical Presupposition

Lexical Presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterance as unstated which is understood. The narrator assumes that she delivers information which is understood but not directly stated. In the data, the writer found some triggers which indicates the lexical presupposition. They are *lagi* (again), *tidaklagi* (no longer), *meninggalkan* (leave), *memasuki* (enter), *mulai* (start), *ambangbatas* (end). The following is the example of lexical presupposition.

- (12) *Misterikedekatan Regina danFarhat Abbas akanmulaiterkuakseiringdengangugatancerai Regina terhadapIlal.*

‘Mistery closeness Regina and Farhat Abbas will start revealalong with claim divorce Regina to Ilal’

The mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness will start to be revealed along with Regina’s divorce petition to Ilal

It can be seen that utterance (12) is triggered by the word *mulai* (start) as the marker of lexical presupposition. The word *mulai*(start) in narrator’s utterance indicates the unstated information which is actually understood about Regina and Farhat Abbas’s closeness myster. If the word *mulai* (start) is deleted, the example (12) only becomes explicit statement of the narrator about something that happens in

the future. It will not contain any implicit assumption inside. Therefore, from example (12) above, the narrator may presuppose:

(12a) *Misterikedekatan Regina danFarhattidakterkuaksebelumnya*

‘Mystery closeness Regina and Farhat not reveal before’

The mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness is not revealed before

If utterance (12) which is indicated lexical presupposition reflected by the use of word *mulai*(start) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(12b) *Misterikedekatan Regina danFarhat Abbas tidak akanmulaiterkuakseiringdengangugatancerai Regina terhadapIlal.*

‘Mystery closeness Regina and Farhat Abbas not will start revealalong with claim divorce Regina to Ilal’

The mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness will not start to be revealed along with Regina’s divorce petition to Ilal

In this case, even utterance (12) is changed into negative form (12b), the presupposition of ‘the mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness is not revealed before’ holds. It shows that (12a) is the presupposition of utterance (12).

By giving lexical presupposition, the narrator desires to bring the information to the viewer of ‘the mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness is not revealed before’. The narrator intends to inform the viewer that previously Regina and Farhat’s closeness mystery is unsolved.

4.1.1.4. Structural Presupposition

Structural Presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterance as the ‘case’. The characteristic of structural presupposition is uttered in question form. Question form here is divided into three kinds. They are yes-no question, alternative question, and wh-form question. The narrator assumes that she delivers the ‘case’ of information. In the data, the writer finds some triggers that indicate structural presupposition. They are *apa* (what), *bagaimana* (how), *siapa* (who), *kapan* (when), *mengapa* (why), *apakah* (do), *akankah* (will), dan *benarkah* (is it true). The following is the example of structural presupposition.

(13) *Akankah Regina menjadipelabuhancintaFarhatsetelahberceraidengan Nia?*

‘Will Regina become port love Farhatafter divorce with Nia?’

Will Regina become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing with Nia?

It can be seen that the utterance (13) is triggered by the word *akankah* (will) as the marker of structural presupposition. The word *akankah* (will) indicates the ‘case’ of Regina who will become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing Nia. If the word *akankah* (will) is deleted, the utterance (13) will change into declarative form. Besides, it only becomes explicit statement of the narrator. It will not contain any implicit assumption or information inside.

Here, the utterance (13) is delivered in yes-no form. It means that the truth of the ‘‘case’’ has not been known. Therefore, from the utterance (13) above, the narrator may presuppose:

(13a) *Entah Regina akanmenjadipelabuhancintaFarhatsetelahberceraidari Nia atautidak.*

‘Between Regina will become port love Farhat after divorce from Nia or not’

Either Regina becomes Farhat’s port of love after divorcing with Nia or she will not

If utterance (13) which is indicated as structural presupposition reflected by the use of word *akankah* (will) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(13b)*Akankah Regina tidak menjadi pelabuhan cinta Farhat setelah bercerai dengan Nia?*

‘Will Regina not become port love Farhatafter divorce with Nia?’

Will Regina not become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing with Nia?

In this case, even utterance (13) is changed into negative form (13b), the presupposition of ‘either Regina becomes Farhat’s port of love after divorcing with Nia or she will not’ holds. It shows that (13a) is the presupposition of utterance (13).

By delivering structural presupposition, the narrator wants to inform the viewer about the ‘case’ of Regina who will become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing Regina. The ‘case’ here has two possibilities of truth based on the answer of yes or no. The first is Regina will become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing Nia, while the second is Regina will become Farhat’s port of love after divorcing Nia. Thus, even the truth of the ‘case’ is still unknown, the narrator emphasizes that the ‘case’ is exist and possible to be true.

4.1.1.5. Non-Factive Presupposition

Non-factive Presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterance as an untrue. Here, the untrue refers to the fact of information. The narrator assumes what she delivers is untrue or not true as a fact. Based on the data, the writer finds two triggers which indicate the non-factive presupposition. They are *seolah* (pretend/figure) and *layaknya* (like). The following is the example of non-factive presupposition.

- (14) *Layaknyapasangan yang tengahdimabukasmara, Regina sudahtaksungkan-sungkanuntukmenggandengmesratanganFarhat.*

‘Appropriate couple who middle drunk love, Regina hasnotshy to hold intimate hand Farhat’

Like as a couple who is intoxicated in love, Regina is not been shy to hold Farhat’s hand intimately.

It can be seen that utterance (14) is triggered by the word *layaknya* (like) as the marker of non- factive presupposition. The word *layaknya* (like) indicates an untrue of Regina and Farhat Abbas. The untrue is connected with their action as a couple who are intoxicated with love. If the word *layaknya* (like) is deleted, utterance (14) only becomes an explicit statement of the narrator about Regina and Farhat as intoxicated love couple. It may It will not contain any implicit assumption inside. Thus, by the word *layaknya* (like), the narrator may presuppose:

- (14a) *Merekabukanpasangan*

‘They not couple’

They are not a couple

If utterance (14) which is indicated as non-factive presupposition reflected by the use of word *layaknya* (like) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(14b) *Bukan layaknya pasangan yang tengah dimabuk asmara, Regina sudah tak sungkan-sungkan untuk menggandeng mesra tangan Farhat.*

‘not appropriate couple who middle drunk love, Regina hasnotshy to hold intimate hand Farhat’

Not like as a couple who is intoxicated in love, Regina is not been shy to hold Farhat’s hand intimately

In this case, even utterance (14) is changed into negative form (14b), the presupposition of “they are not a couple” holds. It shows that (14a) is the presupposition of utterance (14).

By delivering non-factive presupposition, the narrator desires to make the viewer gets the information of ‘Regina and Farhat Abbas are not a couple’. The narrator emphasizes the information that Regina and Farhat as a couple, or in this case an intoxicated love couple, is not true.

4.1.1.6. Counter Factual Presupposition

Counter Factual Presupposition shows the presupposition contained in the utterances as untrue. It refers to the fact which is not true. Moreover, counter factual presupposition not only indicates a fact which is not true, but also indicates an opposite of the fact. The narrator assumes that she delivers the opposite fact of the

information. Here, counter-factual presupposition has a characteristic that the trigger only comes from if-clause form. Based on the data, the writer finds the triggers of counter-factual presupposition are the words *akan*(jika) and *if* (jika). The following is the example of counter-factual presupposition.

- (15) *Farhat Abbas sendirimelontarkanpernyataan yang mengejutkantentangkesiapannyaakanmenikahi Regina jikananti Regina sudahresmiberceraidarilal.*

‘Farhat Abbas alone give statement which surprise about readiness will marry Regina if later Regina has official divorce from Ilal’

Farhat Abbas gives a surprising statement about his readiness will marry Regina if Regina has legitimately divorced from Ilal.

It can be seen utterance (15) is triggered by the words *akan* (will) and *jika* (if) as the marker of counter factual presupposition. The use of words *akan* (will) and *jika* (if) indicates the opposite fact of Regina’s divorce with Ilal. If the words *akan* (will) and *jika* (if) are deleted, utterance (15) will become an incomplete utterance. The information will also be incomplete because there is no conjunction to connect the two clauses. Thus, from the utterance (15) above, the narrator may presuppose:

- (15a) *Regina belumresmiberceraidarilal*

‘Regina not yet divorce from Ilal’

Regina has not legitimately divorced from Ilal

If utterance (15) which is indicated as counter factual presupposition reflected by the use of word *akan* (will) and *jika* (if) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

- (15b) *Farhat Abbas sendiri melontarkan pernyataan yang mengejutkan tentang kesiapannya tidak akan menikahi Regina jika nanti Regina sudah resmi bercerai dari Ilal.*

‘Farhat Abbas alone give statement which surprise about readiness will not marry Regina if later Regina has official divorce from Ilal’

Farhat Abbas gives a surprising statement about his readiness will not marry Regina if Regina has legitimately divorced from Ilal.

In this case, even utterance (15) is changed into negative form (15b), the presupposition of “Regina has not legitimately divorced from Ilal” holds. It shows that (15a) is the presupposition of utterance (15).

By counter factual presupposition, the narrator wants the viewer to get the information of Regina and Ilal divorce that hasn’t been legitimate. In another word, the narrator intends to inform that they are still tied by marital status as husband and wife. It means Regina is still the wife of Ilal.

4.1.2. Double Triggers

The notion of double triggers means there are two triggers which appear within one utterance. The two triggers represent two different types of presupposition. Here, the appearance of two triggers indicates that the combination of two different types of presupposition is possible within one utterance. The explanation of two

triggers representing two different types of presupposition in the narrator's utterance will be discussed in the following subchapter.

4.1.2.1. Structural Presupposition and Factive Presupposition

The combination between structural presupposition and factive presupposition indicates that within a possibility of the truth 'case', there is a fact involved as the part of the 'case'. The following is the example of the combination between structural presupposition and factive presupposition.

- (16) *Apakah Nia menciumadanyakedekatan yang takbiasaantara Regina dan Farhat*

'Whether Nia smell existence closeness which not usual between R Regina and Farhat?'

Do Nia smell the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat?

From utterance (16) above, the writer finds two triggers representing two different types of presupposition. The first trigger comes from the word *apakah* (do) as the marker of structural presupposition. The word *apakah* (do) in the utterance (16) indicates the 'case' of Nia already smell the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat. However, since the word *apakah* (do) is a yes-no question, there are two possibilities of 'case' based on the answer yes and no. Thus, from the utterance (16), the narrator by the word *apakah*(do) may presuppose:

- (16a) *Entah Nia menciumadanyakedekatan yang takbiasaantara Regina danFarhatatautidak*

‘Either Nia smell existence closeness which not usual between Regina and Farhat or not’

Either Nia smells the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat or not.

In this case, if the word *apakah* (do) is deleted, the utterance (16) will change into declarative form. Different from the utterance (13), the utterance (16) still contains any implicit assumption inside though the trigger is deleted. It is because there is another trigger inside. Another trigger comes from the word *mencium* (smell). The word *mencium* (smell) here stands as the marker of factive presupposition. The verb *mencium* (smell) indicates the fact of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat Abbas. Therefore, the narrator by the word *mencium* (smell) may presuppose that:

(16b) *Antara Regina dan Farhat adakedekatan yang tak biasa*

‘Between Regina and Farhat there closeness which not usual’

Between Regina and Farhat exists an unusual closeness

If utterance (16) which is indicated as a combination between structural presupposition and factive presupposition reflected by the use of *apakah* (do) and *mencium* (smell) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(16c) *Apakah Nia tidak mencium adanya kedekatan yang tak biasa antara Regina dan Farhat*

‘Whether Nia smell existence closeness which not usual between R Regina and Farhat?’

Do Nia not smell the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat?

In this case, even utterance (16) is changed into negative form (16c), the presupposition of (16a) and (16b) hold. It shows that (16a) and (16b) are the presupposition of utterance (16).

By delivering the presupposed utterance, the narrator wants the viewer to receive the information of the two 'cases' whose the truth have not been known. The first is Nia already smell the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat. The second is Nia not already smell the existence of unusual closeness between Regina and Farhat. However, of the two 'cases', the narrator intends to inform that there truth is still possible. In line with the factive presupposition in the utterance (16), the narrator also wants the viewer to receive the information about the fact of 'the unusual closeness which exists between Farhat and Regina'. The narrator informs the viewer that the existencethe unusual closeness which exists between Farhat and Regina is a fact. Here, the narrator seems trying to merge both of the intended information within one utterance. The narrator emphasizes the information that a fact is involved as the part of the possibility of the truth 'case'.

4.1.2.2. Lexical Presupposition and Factive Presupposition

The combination between lexical presupposition and factive presupposition indicates that there is a fact involved as the part of unstated information which is understood. The narrator assumes that she delivers unstated information which

contains a fact. The following is the example of the combination between structural presupposition and factive presupposition.

- (17) *Regina dan Farhat tidaklagimenyembunyikan bahasa tubuhdanekspresi wajahbahwakeduanyasalingmencintai.*

‘Regina and Farhat no again hide language body and expression face that both mutual love’

Regina and Farhat no longer hide the body language and face expression of loving each other.

From the utterance (17) above, the writer finds two trigger representing different type of presupposition. The first trigger comes from the word *tidaklagi* (no longer) as the marker of lexical presupposition. The word *tidaklagi* (no longer) indicates the unstated information about the body language and face expression which is hidden by Regina and Farhat. Thus, the narrator by the word *tidaklagi* (no longer) may presuppose:

- (17a) *Regina dan Farhat sebelumnya menyembunyikan bahasa tubuhdanekspresi wajahbahwakeduanyasalingmencintai.*

‘Regina and Farhat before hide language body and expression face that both mutual love’

Regina and Farhat hide the body language and face expression of loving each other before.

Here, if the word *tidaklagi* (no longer) in utterance (17) is deleted, the utterance (17) still contains another implicit assumption. Another implicit assumption here comes from the word *menyembunyikan* (hide). The word *menyembunyikan*

(hide) stands as the marker of factive presupposition. It indicates the fact of Regina and Farhat's body language and face expression of loving each other. Thus, the narrator by the word *menyembunyikan* (hide) may presuppose that:

(17b) *Bahasa tubuh dan ekspresi wajah bahwa keduanya saling mencintai ada.*

'Language body and expression face that both mutual love exist'

The body language and face expression of loving each other exists

If utterance (17) which is indicated as existential presupposition reflected by the use of word *tidak lagi* (no longer) and *menyembunyikan* (hide) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows:

(17c) *Regina dan Farhat tidak lagi tidak menyembunyikan bahasa tubuh dan ekspresi wajah bahwa keduanya saling mencintai.*

'Regina and Farhat no again not hide language body and expression face that both mutual love'

Regina and Farhat no longer do not hide the body language and face expression of loving each other.

In this case, even utterance (17) is changed into negative form (17c), the presupposition of (17a) and (17b) holds. It shows that (17a) and (17b) is the presupposition of utterance (17).

By delivering utterance (17), the narrator wants the viewer to get the unstated information of 'Regina and Farhat hide the body language and face expression of loving each other before'. The narrator informs the viewer that previously Regina and Farhat hide their body language and face expression of loving

each other. Besides, since there is factive presupposition contained in the utterance (17), the narrator wants the viewer to get another information about the fact of ‘the body language and face expression of loving each other exists’. The narrator informs the viewer that the existence of Regina and Farhat’s body language and face expression of loving each other is a fact. Here, the narrator seems trying to merge both of the information within one utterance. The narrator emphasizes that the fact of ‘the body language and face expression of loving each other exists’ is contained as the part of the unstated information.

4.1.2.3. Factive Presupposition and Existential Presupposition

The combination between existential presupposition and factive presupposition indicates that there is an existence of ‘case’ involved as the part of the fact. The narrator assumes that she delivers the fact of information which contains an existence of ‘case’. The following is the example of the combination between existential presupposition and factive presupposition.

(18) *Inilah momen indah Farhat dan Regina saatsalingmemberiperhatian di Pulau Harapan.*

‘this moment beautiful Farhat and Regina when mutual give care in Harapan Island’

It is the lovely moment of Farhat and Regina when they mutually give care in Harapan Island.

From the utterance (18) above, the writer finds two triggers representing different type of presupposition. The first trigger comes from the word *indah* (lovely).

It stands as the marker of factive presupposition. The word *indah* (lovely) indicates the fact of Farhat and Regina's moment. Thus, by the word *indah* (lovely), the narrator may presuppose:

(18a) *Momen Farhat dan Regina saat saling memberi perhatian di Pulau Harapan ada.*

'moment Farhat and Regina when mutual give care in Island Harapan exist'

The moment of Farhat and Regina when they mutually give care in Harapan Island exists.

Here, if the word *indah* (lovely) is deleted, the utterance (18) still contains another implicit assumption. Another implicit assumption comes from the word *memberi*(give). The word *memberi*(give) stands as the marker of existential presupposition. It indicates the existence of care in Harapan Island as the 'case'. The care here refers to the care between Farhat and Regina. Thus, by the word *memberi* (give), the narrator may presuppose:

(18b) *Ada perhatian di Pulau Harapan*

'there care in Island Harapan'

There is a care in Harapan Island

If utterance (18) which is indicated as the combination between existential presupposition and factive presupposition reflected by the use of word *indah* (lovely) and *memberi*(give) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows.

(18c) *Inilah momen takindah Farhat dan Regina saat saling memberi perhatian di Pulau Harapan.*

‘this moment not beautiful Farhat and Regina when mutual give care in Island Harapan’

It is not the lovely moment of Farhat and Regina when they mutually give care in Harapan Island.

In this case, even utterance (18) is changed into negative form (18c), the presupposition of (18a) and (18b) hold. It shows that (18a) and (18b) is the presupposition of utterance (18).

By delivering utterance (18), the narrator wants the viewer to receive the information about the fact of ‘the moment of Farhat and Regina when they mutually give care in Harapan Island exists’. The narrator informs the viewer that the existence of the moment of Farhat and Regina when they mutually give care in Harapan Island is a fact. Furthermore, the existential presupposition in the utterance (18) is intended by the narrator to make the viewer acquiring the information about the existence ‘case’ of ‘there is a care in Harapan Island’. The narrator informs the viewer that there is care of Farhat and Regina during in Harapan Island. The narrator here emphasizes the information that the existence ‘case’ of ‘there is a care in Harapan Island’ is contained as the part of the fact.

4.1.3. Multiple Triggers

The notion of multiple triggers means three triggers appearing within one utterance. The three triggers represent three different types of presupposition. The

appearance of three triggers indicates that the combination of three different types of presupposition is possible within one utterance. The explanation of three triggers representing two different types of presupposition in the narrator's utterance will be discussed in the following subchapter.

4.1.3.1. Structural Presupposition, Factive Presupposition, and Existential Presupposition

The combination between structural presupposition, factive presupposition, and existential presupposition indicates that there is a fact and an existence of 'case' involved as the part of a possibility of the truth 'case'. The narrator assumes that she delivers a possibility of the truth 'case' containing a fact and an existence of 'case'. The following is the example of the combination between structural presupposition, factive presupposition and existential presupposition.

- (19) *Benarkah Regina mengakui kebersamaanya di Pulau Harapan menjadi momen paling romantis yang pernah dialami bersama Farhat?*

'Really Regina admit her togetherness in Island Harapan become moment most romantic which ever been with Farhat?'

Does it true Regina admit her togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat?

From the utterance (19) above, the writer finds three triggers representing three different types of presupposition. The first trigger comes from the word *benarkah* (does it true) as the marker of structural presupposition. The word *benarkah* (does it true) in the utterance (19) indicates the 'case' of 'Regina admits her

togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat'. Then, since the word *benarkah*(does it true) represents a yes-no question, there are two possibilities of "cases" based on the answer yes and no. Thus from the utterance (19), the narrator through the word *benarkah*(does it true) may presuppose:

- (19a) *Entah Regina mengakui kebersamaanya di Pulau Harapan menjadi momen paling romantic yang pernah dialami bersama Farhat atau tidak*

'Either Regina admit her togetherness in IslandHarapanbecome moment most romantic which ever been with Farhat or not'

Either Regina admits her togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat or not.

In this case, if the word *benarkah*(does it true) is deleted, the utterance (19) will change into declarative form. However, the utterance (19) still contains another implicit assumption though the word *benarkah*(does it true) is deleted. It is because the writer finds other two triggers inside. The second trigger comes from the word *mengakui* (admit) as the marker of factive presupposition. The word *mengakui*(admit) indicates the fact of Regina's togetherness in Harapan Island with Farhat. Thus, from the utterance (19) above, the narrators through the word *mengakui*(admit) may presuppose:

- (19b) *Kebersamaan Regina denganFarhat di PulauHarapanmenjadimomem paling romantis yang pernahdialami.*

'Togetherness of Regina with Farhat in Harapan Island becomes moment most romantic which ever experienced'

Togetherness of Regina with Farhat in Harapan Island becomes the most romantic moment ever experienced

Then, the third trigger found in the utterance coming from the word *-nya* (possessive form). In order to verify the existence of the third trigger, the words *benarkah* (do it true) and *mengakui* (admit) are deleted. If the word *benarkah* (do it true) and *mengakui*(admit) are deleted, the word *-nya* (possessive form) still stands as the marker of existential presupposition. It refers to the togetherness with Farhat in Harapan Island. Therefore, through the word *-nya* (possessive form), the narrator may presuppose:

- (19c) *Regina memiliki kebersamaan di Pulau Harapan*
‘Regina own togetherness in Island Harapan’
Regina has togetherness with Farhat in Harapan Island

If utterance (19) which is indicated as the combination between structural presupposition, factive presupposition, and existential presupposition reflected by the use of word *benarkah*(does it true), *mengakui*(admit), and *-nya* (possessive form) is changed into negative form, the utterance will be as follows:

- (19d) *Benarkah Regina tidak mengakui kebersamaanya di Pulau Harapan menjadi momen paling romantic yang pernah dialami bersama Farhat?*
‘Really Regina not admit her togetherness in Island Harapan become moment most romantic which ever been with Farhat?’

Does it true Regina not admit her togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat?

In this case, even utterance (19) is changed into negative form (19d), the presupposition of (19a), (19b), and (19c) hold. It shows that (19a), (19b), and (19c) are the presupposition of utterance (19).

By delivering utterance (19), the narrator wants the viewer to acquire the information of the two 'cases' based on the answer yes or no. The first, Regina admits her togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat. The second, Regina does not admit her togetherness in Harapan Island becoming the most romantic moment ever experienced with Farhat. Here, the truth of the two 'case' has not been known. However, even the truth has not been known, the truth is still possible. In line with the factive presupposition and existential presupposition appear within the structural presupposition, the narrator desires to inform the viewer the fact of Regina's togetherness in Harapan Island. The togetherness of Regina here becomes the most romantic moment ever experienced by her with Farhat. Moreover, the narrator also informs the existence of 'case' that Regina has togetherness in Harapan Island with Farhat. The narrator, thus, by the combination of three different types of presupposition in utterance (19) tries to merge the fact of information and existence 'case' of information as the part of the possibility of the truth 'case'.

4.2. The Function of Presupposition in Narrator's Utterances

In line with presupposition, there are some functions of the narrator in *Silet* infotainment presupposing her utterances. The first is supporting the narrator's position. The second is leading the viewer's assumption, while the last is raising the viewer's belief. The writer finds that presupposition may obtain more public interest for *Silet* infotainment than other infotainment. Through presupposition, the narrator can imply any assumption or information which is indirectly spoken but still conveyed. Its high popularity rating constantly holds seen from *Silet*'s success to win many awards since the first year of its appearance on television until the present time.

4.2.1. Supporting Narrator's Position

In infotainment, the narrator plays an important role. The role is having a correlation with her position to convey information to the viewer. Here, by presupposition, the narrator can convey certain intended information without explicitly spoken. She only needs to narrate her utterances and denotes her utterances with some triggers. Hence, the viewer indirectly can acquire the intended information which she wants. It is because as the one who has owned the information, it is impossible to explain in detail the whole information which she has owned. Of the whole information, there must be certain information that is intended to be conveyed more than other information. The intended information here is classified based on the triggers found. Then, what information she intends to convey may be similar to what the viewer acquires since they have the same shared knowledge. Therefore, through presupposition, the writer finds that presupposition can support the narrator's position

in conveying the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information.

4.2.1.1. Narrator's Position in Conveying the Factual Information

One of the functions of presupposition is able to support the narrator's position in conveying the factual information. The factual information is resulted from the factive presupposition. Through using certain word or verb indicating factive presupposition, the factual information can be derived. The information following the word will be considered as a fact. The following is the example.

(20) Regina admits that she has been divorced by Ilal since 2013.

It can be seen from utterance (20), the word "admit" indicates factive presupposition contained in the utterances. The narrator conveys the factual information of 'Regina has been divorced by Ilal in 2013'. (See the example 11)

4.2.1.2. Narrator's Position in Conveying the 'Case' of Information.

In conveying the 'case' of information, there are three kinds of 'cases' which can be conveyed through presupposition. The 'case' of information can be derived from two types of presupposition. The following are the example.

(21) Farhat is seen doing a trip with Regina to Harapan Island.

(22) Will Regina become Farhat's port of love after divorcing with Nia?

(23) When Ilal divorce Regina?

It can be seen that there are three examples above. The utterance (21) shows the 'case' conveyed by the narrator as an existence. The existence of 'case' here can be conveyed by existential presupposition. Then, the utterance (22) and utterance (23) show structural presupposition contained in utterances. Structural presupposition indicates that there is a 'case'. However, each type of question form in structural presupposition conveys different "case" of information. In wh-question the narrator conveys that there is a 'case' of information known to be true. In yes-no question and alternative question the narrator conveys that the 'case' of information is possibly true meaning the truth of the 'case' hasn't been known. (See the example 10 and 13)

4.2.1.3. Narrator's Position in Conveying the Tacit Information

Another function of the presupposition in narrator's utterances is conveying the tacit information. The tacit information is derived through lexical presupposition. In lexical presupposition, the information following certain verb or phrases will be understood without being explicitly stated. The unstated information will be indirectly interpreted to be understood as the part of what is conveyed. The following is the example.

(24) Mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness seemingly will start to be revealed along with Regina's divorce petition to Ilal.

From utterance (24) above, it can be seen that the word *mulai* (start) indicates lexical presupposition contained in the utterance. The narrator conveys the tacit information of ‘mystery of Regina and Farhat Abbas closeness is not revealed before’. (See the example 12).

4.2.1.4. Narrator’s Position in Conveying the Untrue Information

The notion of untrue means the information isn’t accordance with the fact or reality. Here, the function of conveying untrue information is derived by two different types of presupposition. They are non-factive presupposition and counterfactual presupposition. In non-factive presupposition, the untrue information indicates that the information is not true as a fact. In counter-factual presupposition, the untrue information indicates that the information is not only true as a fact, but contrast with the fact. The following are the examples.

- (25) Pose as a couple who is intoxicated in love, Regina has not been shy to hold Farhat’s hand intimately.
- (26) Farhat Abbas gives a surprising statement about his readiness will marry Regina if Regina has legitimately divorced from Ilal.

As seen from utterance (25) and utterance (26), there are different triggers representing different type of presupposition. Example (23) is triggered by the word ‘pose’ as the marker of non-factive presupposition. It indicates that the information following the verb as not a fact. Then, example (24) is triggered by “if clause” indicating that the information as an opposite of fact. (See the example 14 and 15)

4.2.2. Leading the Viewer's Assumption

Another function presupposition is for leading the viewer's assumption. Here, as the party who conveys the information, the narrator actually has owned certain assumption. During presenting the program, the narrator then implies what assumption she has owned is. Any certain assumption may be able to be encouraged by the narrator over the viewer's mind since both the narrator and the viewer share the same knowledge. The assumption here is surely linked with the assumption that previously has been owned by the narrator. Consequently, the viewer may assume the similar assumption with the narrator. Through some words indicated as the trigger of presupposition, the assumption will refer to certain information since presupposition derives certain information. (See explanation 4.2.1.). Therefore, the narrator is able to lead the viewer to the assumption of the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information.

4.2.2.1. The Assumption of the Factual Information

Based on the explanation in utterance (20), the factual information can be derived fromfactive presupposition. Here, the narrator has previously owned an assumption of the factual information. The narrator, then, implies her assumption of the factual information to the viewer by denoting her utterance with certain word

indicated as the trigger of factive presupposition. The information following the word may be assumed as the factual information by the viewer since there is shared knowledge involved. Thus, the narrator can lead the viewer to the assumption of the factual information.

4.2.2.2. The Assumption of the ‘Case’ of Information

Based on the explanation in utterance (21), (22), and (23), the ‘case’ of information can be derived from two types of presupposition. The first type is existential presupposition. The second type is structural presupposition. In existential presupposition the ‘case’ is indicated as an existence. In structural presupposition the ‘case’ is indicated as a truth. Structural presupposition has a characteristic that the utterance is uttered in question form. Here, the assumption toward the ‘case’ of information is actually has been owned by the narrator. Through certain word indicated as the trigger of existential and factive presupposition, the narrator implies her assumption toward the ‘case’ of information to the viewer. The viewer here by the involvement of shared knowledge may assume the similar ‘case’ of information. Therefore, the narrator can lead the viewer to the assumption of the ‘case’ of information.

4.2.2.3. The Assumption of the Tacit Information

Based on the explanation of utterance (24), the tacit information is derived from the lexical presupposition. As the party conveying the information, the narrator has assumed the tacit information. The tacit information, then, is implied to the

viewer through the word indicated as the trigger of lexical presupposition. The information following the word may be determined by the viewer as the tacit information. The viewer's assumption toward the tacit information can be encouraged since the narrator and the viewer shares the same knowledge. Thus, the narrator leads the viewer assumption to the assumption of tacit information.

4.2.2.3. The Assumption of the Untrue Information

Based on the explanation of utterance (25) and utterance (26), the untrue information is derived from two different types of presupposition. The first type is non-factive presupposition. The second type is counterfactual presupposition. Actually, both of the presupposition types indicate the same intended information. The untrue means the information is not true. However, the difference takes place in the degree of the untrue. In one hand, non-factive presupposition indicates that the information is not true as a fact. In the other hand, counterfactual presupposition indicates that the information is not only true as a fact, but also as the opposite from fact. The narrator implies the untrue information which previously has been assumed by her through the word indicated as the trigger of the two presupposition types. Then, the untrue information may be similarly assumed by the viewer since they shares the same knowledge. Thus, the narrator leads the viewer assumption to the assumption of the untrue information.

4.2.3. Raising the Viewer's Belief

The last function of presupposition in narrator's utterances is for raising the viewer's belief. Here, the notion of presenting information in infotainment doesn't merely desire to present 'something' to the viewer, but rather desire to make the viewer believe 'something'. The writer defines 'something' as information about an affair between Farhat and Regina since the main topic or context of the information is about to reveal an affair between Regina and Farhat.

Concerning the presupposition, the narrator actually has own certain belief before making utterance. The belief refers to an affair between Farhat and Regina. Then, by denoting her utterance with some words indicated as the presupposition trigger, the narrator has an opportunity to indirectly convey any certain intended information. The writer finds the intended information here is the part to construct the viewer's belief about an affair between Regina and Farhat since it mostly points about them. The intended information here is treated as true by the narrator. The viewer, then, may be able to accept or consider that the intended information as something which is true since there is shared knowledge involved. Thus, by the support of shared knowledge the viewer's belief can be raised by the narrator through the intended information conveyed since the viewer may accept it as a true thing. In another word, presupposition raises the viewer's belief through the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information.

4.2.3.1. The Viewer's Belief through the Factual Information

In accordance with the explanation in utterance (20), the intended information conveyed by the factive presupposition is factual information. Through certain word as the trigger of factive presupposition, it enables the narrator to convey the factual information. Here, the narrator treats the factual information as something which is true. The factual information here is intended by the narrator to be the part to construct the viewer's belief toward an affair between Regina and Farhat. Therefore, by the support of shared knowledge, the viewer's belief can be raised through the factual information since the viewer accepts it as true.

4.2.3.2. The Viewer's Belief through the 'Case' of Information

In accordance with the explanation in utterance (21), (22) and (23), the intended information about the 'case' of information is conveyed by two different types of presupposition. The two different types are existential presupposition and structural presupposition. The narrator can convey the 'case' of information by certain word indicated as the trigger of existential presupposition and structural presupposition. The 'case' of information here is treated by the narrator as something which is true. It is intended by the narrator to be the part to construct the viewer's belief over the information of Regina and Farhat's affair. Then, the viewer may accept the 'case' of information as a true thing because of the same shared knowledge. Therefore, the viewer's belief can be raised through the 'case' of information.

4.2.3.3. The Viewer's Belief through the Tacit Information

In accordance with the explanation in utterance (24), the intended information derived by the lexical information is tacit information. By denoting the utterance with the word as the trigger of lexical presupposition, the tacit information can be delivered by the narrator to the viewer. The narrator treats the tacit information as something which is true. The tacit information is intended to be informed by the narrator as the part of constructing the viewer's belief. Then, the tacit information may also be accepted by the viewer as true since there is shared knowledge involved. Hence, the narrator can raise the viewer's belief through the tacit information.

4.2.3.4. The Viewer's Belief through the Untrue Information

In accordance with the explanation in utterance (25) and utterance (26), the untrue information is informed through two different types of presupposition. They are non-factive presupposition and counter-factual presupposition. The narrator informs the untrue information by denoting her utterance with some triggers of the two presupposition types. The untrue information is treated as true and intended to be informed for constructing the same belief over the viewer's mind. By the involvement of shared knowledge, the viewer, then, may accept that the untrue information is a true thing. Hence, the narrator can raise the viewer's belief through the untrue information.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer would like to present the conclusion of the research result which is discussed in the previous chapter. According to the discussion in the previous chapter, the presupposition trigger that appears from the narrator's utterance is divided into three parts based on the number of trigger found. They are single trigger, double triggers, and multiple triggers. Single trigger means one trigger found representing one presupposition type within one utterance, while double trigger means two triggers found representing two different presupposition types within one utterance. Then, multiple trigger means three triggers found representing three different types of presupposition within one utterance.

Based on single trigger, the presupposition trigger found within one utterance can represent the six presupposition types. The presupposition types are existential presupposition, factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factive presupposition and counter-factual presupposition. In double triggers, there are three kinds of combination between two different types of presupposition found within one utterance. However, the combination does not represent all the presupposition types. The trigger of non-factive presupposition and counter factual presupposition is not found in the narrator's utterance as the part of combination between two different presupposition types. Here, the found combinations are structural presupposition and factive presupposition, lexical presupposition and factive presupposition, existential presupposition and factive presupposition. Similar with double trigger, in multiple triggers the combination does not represent all the six presupposition types. There is only one kind of combination

between three different types of presupposition found within one utterance. The found combination consists of structural presupposition, factive presupposition, and existential presupposition. The trigger of lexical presupposition, non-factive presupposition, and counterfactual presupposition is not found as the part of combination between three different types of presupposition.

Concerning the function of presupposition, there are three functions of presupposition in the narrator's utterance. They are supporting narrator's position, leading the viewer's assumption, and raising the viewer's belief. However, of the three functions, there are specific functions related to the presupposition types. In supporting the narrator's position, presupposition supports the narrator's position in conveying the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information. In leading the viewer's assumption, presupposition leads the viewer to the assumption of the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information. Then, in raising the viewer's belief, presupposition raises the viewer's belief through the factual information, the 'case' of information, the tacit information, and the untrue information.

REFERENCES

- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Branston, G. and Stafford, R. (2005). *The Media Student's Book*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.
- Mey, Jacob L. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fromkin, Victoria. (2003). *An Introduction to Language*. Australia: Michael Roseberg Publishers.
- Stalnaker, James C. (1987). Communicative Competence, Language Proficiency and Beyond, in Crystal David (ed.), (1987). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Renkema, Jane. (1993). *Discourse Studies an Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Cummings, Louise. (2007). *Pragmatik: Sebuah Perspektif Multidisipliner*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- W.Best, Jhon. (1981). *Research in Education, Fourth edition*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, INC.
- Brinton, Laurel J. (2000). *The Structure of Modern English: A Linguistics Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mahsun. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sugiyono. (2005) *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: ALFABET.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta : Duta Wacana. University Press.
- Hadi, Sutrisno (1982). *Metodologi Research*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University.
- Arikunto, Suharsini. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik (Edisi Revisi VI)*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Karyaningrum, Dyah. (2007). *Pragmatics Presupposition on Advertisement (Case Study on Fortune Magazine) Thesis*. Diponegoro University: Semarang.
- Febuana, Dewi Masyitoh. (2008). *Pragmatics Presupposition Analysis on Advertisement in "KARTINI" magazine. (From March to December 2004 editions) Thesis*. Diponegoro University: Semarang.

Rubiyanti, Afrin. (2011). Presupposition in Interrogative Headlines on "ALLKPOP" News and Gossip Site Thesis. Diponegoro University: Semarang.

Kusumaningsari, Ratih. (2010). Pra-anggapan Pragmatik pada Novel "The Alchemist" Karya Paulo Coelho Thesis. Diponegoro University: Semarang.

Yulistina, Rachma. (2008). Pragmatics pPresuppositions in Drama Script "The Wild Duck" written by Henrik Ibsen Thesis. Diponegoro University: Semarang.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Presupposition Types Contained in Narrator's Utterance

1. Single Trigger

Existential Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Farhat terlihat meretas perjalanan bersama Regina ke Pulau Harapan	Terlihat
2	Namun disaat Farhat dan Regina tengah memperlihatkan kebersamaan dan kemesraan, banyak pihak justru terus melancarkan tudingan demi tudingan	Memperlihatkan
3	Secara eksklusif kepada tim Silet, Regina justru mencurahkan isi hatinya jika ia telah ditalak Ilal.	-nya
4	Tiba-tiba Rabu tanggal 5 Maret mendaftarkan gugatan perceraianya terhadap sang suami, Ilal.	-nya

Factive Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Regina pun mengaku telah ditalak Ilal sejak tahun 2013 lalu	Mengaku
2	Entah apa sesungguhnya dibalik motif Regina melayangkan surat gugatan cerai pada tanggal 5 Maret lalu.	Entah
3	Farhat dan Regina tampak mesra menikmati deburan ombak dan tiupan angin laut yang begitu kencang	Tampak
4	Dengan menggandeng tangan Farhat, Regina begitu tampak nyaman berada disamping Farhat	Tampak
5	Farhat siap bercerai dengan Nia Daniati begitupun Regina yang dengan mantap menceraikan Ilal, suaminya.	Siap
6	Gugatan cerai Regina terhadap Ilal nampaknya merupakan buntut dari ikrar talak yang dilontarkan Ilal beberapa waktu silam	Nampaknya
7	Gugatan cerai Regina terhadap Ilal nampaknya menambah panas situasi	Nampaknya

Lexical Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Inilah ambang batas 12 tahun pernikahan yang dipertahankan Farhat Abbas dan Nia Daniati.	Ambang batas
2	Bahkan Farhat memilih meninggalkan rumah sejak kasus perceraian mereka dilimpahkan ke pengadilan agama.	Meninggalkan
3	Misteri dengan kedekatan Regina dan Farhat Abbas akan mulai terkuak seiring dengan gugatan cerai Regina terhadap Ilal	Mulai
4	Meski masih bergelut dengan sidang perceraian masing-masing, Regina dan Farhat tak malu-malu memamerkan lagi kemesraan di hadapan publik, seperti yang terlihat saat mereka di pulau Harapan.	Lagi
5	Ditengah perjalanan sidang perceraian yang sudah memasuki sidang perdana dengan agenda mediasi, kini mereka benar-benar dibulatkan tekad apakah mengakhiri perjalanan rumah tangganya atau terus bersama.	Memasuki

Structural Presupposition

NO	QUESTION	TRIGGER
1	Benarkah Farhat sendiri juga tak keberatan jika suatu saat menikah dengan Regina?	Yes-no question
2	Akankah dia hadir pada sidang kedua nanti?	Yes-no question
3	Bagaimana Farhat membagi harta gono gini jika bercerai?	Wh-question
4	Bagaimana pasangan ini akan menghadapi sidang kedua mereka nanti?	Wh-question
5	Akankah Nia tetap bersikukuh menuntut janji Farhat?	Yes-no question
6	Benarkah Farhat justru merasa keberatan lantaran selama tujuh tahun terakhir ia menganggap Nia tidak menjalankan peran sebagai istri?	
7	Kapan Ilal menalak Regina?	Wh-question

8	Apakah memang antara Farhat dan Regina sudah memiliki hubungan yang teramat special?	Yes-no question
9	Apakah pada akhirnya Regina dan Farhat menikah ?	Yes-no question
10	Siapa yang benar dan siapa yang melakukan pembenaran ?	Wh-question
11	Benarkah Farhat sendiri juga tidak keberatan jika suatu saat menikah dengan Regina ?	Yes-no question
12	Benarkan keinginan Regina untuk segera bercerai dari suaminya mendapat halangan karena buku nikah yang digunakan dituding palsu?	Yes-no question
13	Mengapa gugatan perceraian ini dilayangkan Regina persisi bertepatan dengan proses perceraian Farhat dan Nia Daniati yang tengah berlangsung?	Wh-question
14	Sudahkah kata sepakat tersebut tercapai?	Yes-no question
15	Mungkinkah ini semua hanya kebetulan ataukah memang ada hubungannya dengan sosok Farhat Abbas?	Alternatif Question
16	Lalu seperti apa pula perhatian Farhat kepada Regina saat membuatkan bakso special?	Wh-question
17	Seperti apa pula perhatian Farhat yang memberikan suapan bakso kepada Regina?	Wh-question
18	Benarkah dibalik kemesraan mereka, Regina dan Farhat sesungguhnya telah menikah siri ?	Yes-no question
19	Apa kata Farhat dan Regina ketika dituding telah berselingkuh?	Wh-question
20	Seperti apa reaksi Nia yang dituding Farhat hanya mengejar harta dan gila harta?	Wh-question
21	Benarkah Nia menginginkan rumah yang saat ini menjadi tempat tinggalnya menjadi haknya?	Yes-no question
22	Benarkah Farhat kini tak sudi jika Nia memiliki sepenuhnya harta itu?	Yes-no question
23	Benarkah Nia Daniati masih menunggu komitmen Farhat terkait rumah dihibahkan kepada anaknya serta uang 100 juta rupiah perbulan untuk anaknya?	Yes-no question

Non-factive Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Dimana ada Farhat, disitu tampil sosok Regina yang seolah menjadi nyonya Farhat saat bertemu dengan orang-orang di pulau Harapan	Seolah menjadi
2	Layaknya pasangan yang tengah dimabuk asmara, Regina sudah tak sungkan-sungkan untuk menggandeng mesra tangan Farhat	Layaknya

Counter- factual Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Jika Farhat dan Nia tetap tidak menemukan kata sepakat, akankah Nia kembali ke panggung bernyanyi untuk menutup kebutuhan sendiri dan si buah hati	If-clause
2	Farhat Abbas sendiri melontarkan pernyataan yang megejutkan tentang kesiapannya akan menikahi Regina jika nanti Regina sudah resmi bercerai dari Ilal.	If-clause

2. Double Triggers

Structural Presupposition & Factive Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Apa kata Ilal terkait kesiapan Farhat yang akan menikahi Regina?	- Wh-question - Kesiapan
2	Apakah Nia telah mencium adanya kedekatan yang tak biasa antara Regina dan Farhat?	- Yes-no question - Mencium
3	Bernarkah Regina dan Farhat tampak selalu mesra saat dalam perjalanan menuju ke Pulau Harapan?	- Yes-no question - Tampak
4	Apakah ini pernyataan menjadi jawaban tersendiri jika Farhat memang ternyata memiliki rasa dan hubungan dengan Regina?	- Yes-no question - Tenyata

Lexical Presupposition & Factive Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Di Pulau Harapan Kepulauan Seribu menjadi saksi kemesraan dan kebersamaan Regina dan Farhat Abbas yang kini tak ditutupi lagi.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Saksi- Lagi
2	Farhat dan Regina tidak lagi menyembunyikan bahasa tubuh dan ekspresi wajah bahwa keduanya memang saling mencintai	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Lagi- Menyembunyikan
3	Meski jalannya sidang sudah memasuki empat kali, masalah pembagian harta gono-gini tampak belum mencapai titik temu.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Memasuki- Tampak

Existential Presupposition & Factive Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Inilah momen indah Farhat dan Regina saat saling memberi perhatian di Pulau Harapan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Indah- Memberi

3. Multiple Trigger

Structural Presupposition, Factive Presupposition, and Existential Presupposition

NO	STATEMENT	TRIGGER
1	Benarkah Regina mengakui kebersamaannya di Pulau Harapan Kepulauan Seribu menjadi momen paling romantis yang pernah dialami bersama Farhat?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Yes-No Question- Mengakui- -nya

2	Lantas apa yang membuat Farhat justru bahagia ketika Regina mendaftarkan gugatan perceraiaanya ke pengadilan agama Jakarta Selatan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wh-question - Bahagia - -nya
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------